On the Efficiency of Solving Boolean Polynomial Systems with the Characteristic Set Method[☆]

Zhenyu Huang, Yao Sun, Dongdai Lin

SKLOIS, Institute of Information Engineering, CAS, Beijing 100093, China

arXiv:1405.4596v2 [cs.SC] 6 Feb 2015

Abstract

An improved characteristic set algorithm for solving Boolean polynomial systems is proposed. This algorithm is based on the idea of converting all the polynomials into monic ones by zero decomposition, and using additions to obtain pseudo-remainders. To improve the efficiency, two important techniques are applied in the algorithm. One is eliminating variables by new generated linear polynomials, and the other is optimizing the order of choosing polynomial for zero decomposition. We present some complexity bounds of the algorithm by analyzing the structure of the zero decomposition tree. Some experimental results show that this new algorithm is more efficient than precious characteristic set algorithms for solving Boolean polynomial systems, and in some cases the running time of this algorithm can be well predicted by analyzing a part of branches in the zero decomposition tree.

Keywords: Boolean polynomial system, Characteristic Set method, Computation complexity, Zero decomposition, Cryptanalysis.

1. Introduction

Solving Boolean polynomial systems, which is solving polynomial systems in the ring $\mathbb{R}_2 = \mathbb{F}_2[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]/\langle x_1^2 + x_1, x_2^2 + x_2, \ldots, x_n^2 + x_n\rangle$, plays a fundamental role in many important fields such as coding theory, cryptology, and analysis of computer hardware. To find efficient algorithms to solve such systems is a central issue both in mathematics and in computer science. Efficient algebraic algorithms for solving Boolean polynomial systems have been developed, such as the Gröbner basis methods (Bardet et al., 2003; Brickenstein, 2007; Faugère, 1999, 2002; Faugère and Ars, 2003) and the XL algorithm and its improved versions (Courtois, 2000).

[☆]This work was in part supported by National 973 Program of China under Grants No. 2013CB834203 and No. 2011CB302400, the "Strategic Priority Research Program" of the Chinese Academy of Sciences under Grant No. XDA06010701 and IIE's Research Project on Cryptography (No. Y3Z0018102 and No. Y3Z0013102

Email addresses: huangzhenyu@iie.ac.cn (Zhenyu Huang), sunyao@iie.ac.cn (Yao Sun), ddlin@iie.ac.cn (Dongdai Lin)

The **characteristic set (CS)** method is a tool for studying polynomial, algebraic differential, and algebraic difference equation systems (Aubry et al., 1999; Boulier et al., 1995; Bouziane et al., 2001; Chou, 1988; Chou and Gao, 1990; Dahan et al, 2005; Gallo and Mishra, 1991; Gao et al., 2007; Hubert, 2000; Kalkbrener, 1993; Kapur and Wan, 1990; Lazard, 1991; Lin and Liu, 1993; Moller, 1993; Wang, 1993; Wu, 1986; Yang et al., 1996). The idea of the method is reducing equation systems in general form to equation systems in the form of triangular sets. With this method, solving an equation system can be reduced to solving univariate equations in cascaded form. The CS method can also be used to compute the dimension, the degree, and the order for an equation system, to solve the radical ideal membership problem, and to prove theorems from elementary and differential geometries.

In most existing work on CS methods, the zeros of the equations are taken in an algebraically closed field which is infinite. In (Chai et al., 2008; Gao and Huang, 2012), the CS method is extended to solving the polynomial systems in the finite fields. Especially, in (Gao and Huang, 2012), an efficient CS algorithm **MFCS** (Multiplication-free CS) for solving Boolean polynomial systems was proposed. The idea of this algorithm is using the property of $\mathbb{F}_2$ to convert the initials of all Boolean polynomials into constant 1 by zero decomposition, then compute pseudo-remainders by addition. For **MFCS**, the intermediate expression swell is effectively avoided due to its property and the usage of SZDD (Minto, 1993). Moreover, **MFCS** has good performances in solving some systems with block triangular structure (Gao and Huang, 2012; Huang and Lin, 2011).

However, In (Gao and Huang, 2012), the authors only introduced the basic algorithm. Some important techniques, which were used in the implementation and can greatly improve the efficiency of the algorithm, were not presented. Moreover, the complexity of **MFCS** is unknown. Hence, the motivation of this paper is to summarize and improve these techniques, and estimate the complexity of the algorithm after applying these techniques.

In this paper, we propose an algorithm **BCS** by modifying **MFCS** with two major techniques. The first one is adding a simplify process into algorithm, in which we use the linear polynomials generated in the zero decomposition process to eliminate variables. The second one is using an alterable `choose` function to determine the order of choosing polynomial for zero decomposition.

By analyzing the depth of the zero decomposition tree, we obtain some complexity bounds of **BCS** for solving random systems. Furthermore, based on the idea of estimate the depth of the zero decomposition tree, we proposed a method to predict the running time of **BCS**, which is quite accurate for some systems.

From the analysis of **BCS**, we deduce that the number of branches in the zero decomposition tree of **BCS** always decrease when the number of input polynomials increases. According to this, we analyze the behavior of the running time of **BCS** when the number of input polynomial increases.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the **BCS** algorithm and prove its correctness. In Section 3, we present some complexity bounds of **BCS**. In Section 4, we talk about the new features of **BCS**. In Section 5, conclusions are presented.

2. An improved Characteristic Set algorithm

2.1. Notations

First, let's introduce some basic knowledge about the characteristic set method over $\mathbb{F}_2$. For more details, the reader is referred to (Gao and Huang, 2012). For a Boolean polynomial $P \in \mathbb{F}_2[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]/\langle x_1^2 + x_1, x_2^2 + x_2, \ldots, x_n^2 + x_n\rangle$, the *class* of P, denoted as $\mathrm{cls}(P)$, is the largest index c such that x_c occurs in P. If P is a constant, we set $\mathrm{cls}(P)$ to be 0. If $\mathrm{cls}(P) = c > 0$, we call x_c the *leading variable* of P, denoted as $\mathrm{lvar}(P)$. The leading coefficient of P as a univariate polynomial in $\mathrm{lvar}(P)$ is called the *initial* of P, and is denoted as $\mathrm{init}(P)$.

A sequence of nonzero polynomials

$$\mathcal{A}: \quad A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_r$$

is a *triangular set* if either $r = 1$ and $A_1 = 1$, or $0 < \mathrm{cls}(A_1) < \cdots < \mathrm{cls}(A_r)$. A Boolean polynomial P is called *monic*, if $\mathrm{init}(P) = 1$. Moreover, if the elements of a triangular set are all monic, we call it a monic triangular set.

Given a polynomial system $\mathbb{P}$, we use $\mathrm{Zero}(\mathbb{P})$ to denote the common zero of this system, that is

$$\mathrm{Zero}(\mathbb{P}) = \{(a_1, \cdots, a_n), a_i \in \mathbb{F}_2, s.t., \forall f_i \in \mathbb{P}, f_i(a_1, \cdots, a_n) = 0\}.$$

Obviously, for a monic triangular set $\mathcal{A}: A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_r$, $|\mathrm{Zero}(\mathcal{A})| = 2^{n-r}$.

By the characteristic set method, we can decompose $\mathrm{Zero}(\mathbb{P})$ into the disjoint union of the zero sets of several monic triangular sets. That is

$$\mathrm{Zero}(\mathbb{P}) = \bigcup_i \mathrm{Zero}(\mathcal{A}_i)$$

where each $\mathcal{A}_i$ is a monic triangular set and $\mathrm{Zero}(\mathcal{A}_i) \cap \mathrm{Zero}(\mathcal{A}_j) = \emptyset$ for any $i \neq j$. Obviously, if the number of polynomials in $\mathcal{A}_i$ is d_i, we have $|\mathrm{Zero}(\mathbb{P})| = \sum_i 2^{n-d_i}$.

In the following paragraphs of this paper, unless otherwise stated, for a polynomial system, we use n to denote the number of variables and m to denote the number of polynomials.

2.2. The **BCS** *algorithm*

In this section, we introduce the improved characteristic set algorithm **BCS**. This algorithm is a variant of algorithm **MFCS** proposed in (Gao and Huang, 2012) by adding important techniques.

Algorithm 1: BCS

input : A polynomial system $\mathbb{P} = \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m\}$.
output: Monic triangular sets $\{\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{A}_t\}$ such that $\mathrm{Zero}(\mathbb{P}) = \cup_{i=1}^{t} \mathrm{Zero}(\mathcal{A}_i)$ and $\mathrm{Zero}(\mathcal{A}_i) \cap \mathrm{Zero}(\mathcal{A}_j) = \emptyset$

1 $\mathbb{P}^* = \{\mathbb{P}\}, \mathcal{A}^* = \emptyset$;
2 **while** $\mathbb{P}^* \neq \emptyset$ **do** `/* P* is a group of polynomial sets */`
3 Select a polynomial set $\mathbb{Q}$ from $\mathbb{P}^*$;
4 Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbb{Q}^*$ be the output of **Triset**($\mathbb{Q}$);
5 **if** $\mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$ **then** $\mathcal{A}^* = \mathcal{A}^* \cup \{\mathcal{A}\}$;
6 $\mathbb{P}^* \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^* \cup \mathbb{Q}^*$;
7 **return** $\mathcal{A}^*$.

Algorithm 2: TriSet

input : A polynomial system $\mathbb{P} = \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m\}$.
output: A monic triangular set $\mathcal{A}$ and a group of polynomial sets $\mathbb{P}^*$ such that $\text{Zero}(\mathbb{P}) = \text{Zero}(\mathcal{A}) \cup_{\mathbb{Q}\in\mathbb{P}^*} \text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q})$, $\text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q}_i) \cap \text{Zero}(\mathcal{A}) = \emptyset$, $\text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q}_i) \cap \text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q}_j) = \emptyset$ for any $\mathbb{Q}_i, \mathbb{Q}_j \in \mathbb{P}^*$.

$\mathbb{P}^* \leftarrow \emptyset$, $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \emptyset$. Let n_{monic} be the number of monic polynomials in $\mathbb{P}$;
while $\mathbb{P} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
  Let $\mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathbb{P}'$ be the output of `Simplify(`$\mathbb{P}$`)`;
  if $\mathcal{A}', \mathbb{P}' = \emptyset$; **then return** $\emptyset$ and $\mathbb{P}^*$;
  else $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow A \cup \mathcal{A}'$, $\mathbb{P} \leftarrow \mathbb{P}'$;
  if $n_{monic} \geq t$ **then** `/* t is a threshold value */`
    Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the set of the monic polynomials in $\mathbb{P}$, and $\mathbb{P} \leftarrow \mathbb{P} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$;
    Let $\mathbb{Q} \leftarrow$ `AddReduce(`$\mathbb{Q}$`)`;
    if $\mathbb{Q} = \emptyset$ **then return** $\emptyset$ and $\mathbb{P}^*$;
    else $\mathbb{P} \leftarrow \mathbb{P} \cup \mathbb{Q}$;
  if *The elements in* $\mathbb{P}$ *are all monic* **then**
    if *For every class, there is only one element in* $\mathbb{P}$ **then**
      $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \mathcal{A} \cup \mathbb{P}$;
      return $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbb{P}^*$;
    else
      $\mathbb{P}' \leftarrow$`AddReduce(`$\mathbb{P}$`)`;
      if $\mathbb{P}' = \emptyset$ **then return** $\emptyset$ and $\mathbb{P}^*$;
      else $\mathbb{P} \leftarrow \mathbb{P}'$;
  else `/* The zero decomposition process */`
    $P \leftarrow$ `Choose(`$\mathbb{P}$`)`, and suppose $\text{cls}(P) = c, P = Ix_c + U$; `/* Choose is a function that chooses an non-monic element from a polynomial set */`
    $\mathbb{P}_1 \leftarrow (\mathbb{P} \setminus \{P\}) \cup \mathcal{A} \cup \{I, U\}$, and $\mathbb{P}^* \leftarrow \mathbb{P}^* \cup \{\mathbb{P}_1\}$;
    $\mathbb{P} \leftarrow (\mathbb{P} \setminus \{P\}) \cup \{x_c + U\} \cup \{I + 1\}$;
    $n_{monic} \leftarrow n_{monic} + 1$;
return $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbb{P}^*$.

Function: `Simplify`

input : A polynomial set $\mathbb{P}$
output: A monic triangular set $\mathcal{A}$, and a polynomial set $\mathbb{P}$

$\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \emptyset$;
if $1 \in \mathbb{P}$ **then return** $\emptyset$ and $\emptyset$;
while $\mathbb{P}$ *has a linear polynomial* $P = x_c + L$ **do** `/*` $\text{cls}(P) = c$ `*/`
  Substitute x_c with L for the other elements in $\mathbb{P}$;
  $\mathcal{A} \leftarrow \mathcal{A} \cup \{x_c + L\}$;
  if $1 \in \mathbb{P}$ **then return** $\emptyset$ and $\emptyset$;
return $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbb{P}$.

Function: `AddReduce`

input : A polynomial set $\mathbb{P}$
output: A polynomial set $\mathbb{P}'$

1 $\mathbb{P}' \leftarrow \emptyset$;
2 Sort the elements of $\mathbb{P}$ by classes and obtain polynomial sets $\mathbb{Q}_1, \mathbb{Q}_2, \ldots, \mathbb{Q}_t$; `/* The class of elements in` $\mathbb{Q}_i$ `is` c_i `*/`
3 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ *to* t **do**
4 Let $Q \in \mathbb{Q}_i$ be the polynomial with lowest total degree;
5 $\mathbb{Q}_i \leftarrow \mathbb{Q}_i \setminus \{Q\}$, $\mathbb{P}' = \mathbb{P}' \cup \{Q\}$;
6 **while** $\mathbb{Q}_i \neq \emptyset$ **do**
7 Choose an element $Q_j \in \mathbb{Q}_i$, $\mathbb{Q}_i \leftarrow \mathbb{Q}_i \setminus \{Q_j\}$;
8 $Q_j \leftarrow Q_j + Q$;
9 **if** $Q_j = 1$ **then return** $\emptyset$;
10 **if** $Q_j \neq 0$ **then** $\mathbb{P}' = \mathbb{P}' \cup \{Q_j\}$;
11 **return** $\mathbb{P}'$.

In Algorithm **BCS**, **Triset** is the algorithm that solves the current polynomial system and generates some new polynomial systems, and it is the major part of **BCS**. Here we interpret several main processes of **Triset**.

- At Step 3, we are trying to find linear polynomials in the current system. If there is a linear polynomial $x_c + L$, we use L to substitute x_c in other polynomials, and add this $x_c + L$ into the monic triangular set $\mathcal{A}$.
- At Step 19-23, we convert polynomials into monic ones by zero decomposition. It is based on the fact that $\text{Zero}(Ix_c + U) = \text{Zero}(x_c + U, I + 1) \cup \text{Zero}(I, U)$.
- At Step 6-10, in the current system there are more that t monic polynomials, we execute `AddReduce` to eliminate the leading variables of these polynomials by addition.
- At Step 11-18, the elements in $\mathbb{P}$ are all monic, if they have different classes, we add them into $\mathcal{A}$. Otherwise, we use `AddReduce` to eliminate the leading variable of them.

The differences of **BCS** and **MFCS** presented in (Gao and Huang, 2012) are:

1) In **MFCS**, `Choose` always chooses the polynomials with highest class. In **BCS**, `Choose` can be any form.
2) In **MFCS**, `AddReduce` is executed when the polynomials with the highest class are all monic. In **BCS**, `AddReduce` is executed when the number of new generated monic polynomials reaches the threshold value t or the polynomials are all monic.
3) In **BCS**, we add a new function `Simplify` to deal with the linear polynomials generated in the solving process.

Remark 1 *Actually, in the implementation of* **MFCS** *in (Gao and Huang, 2012),* `Choose` *is choosing the polynomial with "simplest" initial and the* `Simplify` *process was already used. However, the effect of these techniques to the correctness and complexity of the algorithm was not discussed before. Hence, in the following of this paper, we will talk about these problems in theoretical and experimental aspects.*

Now let's show the correctness of **BCS**.

Lemma 1 *Algorithm* **Triset** *is correct.*

Proof: It is easy to check that `AddReduce` and `Simplify` is correct. Here, we denote the input polynomial system by $\mathbb{P}_0$, and the polynomial systems we deal with in Loop 2 by $\mathbb{P}$. Obviously, the elements in $\mathbb{P}$ may be updated after each iteration of Loop 2. Note that, the zero decomposition operations(Step 20-23) are based on the fact that $\text{Zero}(Ix_c + U) = \text{Zero}(x_c+U, I+1)\cup\text{Zero}(I, U)$ and $\text{Zero}(x_c+U, I+1)\cap\text{Zero}(I, U) = \emptyset$. Thus, in any iteration we always have $\text{Zero}(\mathbb{P}_0) = \text{Zero}(\mathbb{P}) \cup_{\mathbb{Q}\in\mathbb{P}^*} \text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q})$, $\text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q}_i) \cap \text{Zero}(\mathcal{A}) = \emptyset$, $\text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q}_i) \cap \text{Zero}(\mathbb{Q}_j) = \emptyset$ for any $\mathbb{Q}_i, \mathbb{Q}_j \in \mathbb{P}^*$. Since $\text{Zero}(P, Q) = \text{Zero}(P, P + Q)$ and $\text{Zero}(Ix_c + U, x_c + L) = \text{Zero}(IL + U, x_c + L)$, we know that except the zero decomposition operations, other operations will not change the zero set of $\mathbb{P}$. It means that, if the algorithm output a result, we have $\text{Zero}(\mathcal{A}) = \text{Zero}(\mathbb{P})$. This proves the correctness of the zero decomposition equations of the output.

Now we show that $\mathcal{A}$ must be a monic triangular set. There are two cases in which a polynomial P can be added into $\mathcal{A}$.

1) $P = x_c + L$ is a linear polynomial. It is monic, and we substitute all the x_c with L in other polynomials, hence other elements in $\mathcal{A}$ will not have x_c.

2) P is added into $\mathcal{A}$ in step 13. In this case, for every class, there is only one element in $\mathbb{P}$ and it is monic. Therefore, the elements being added into $\mathcal{A}$ will have different class.

It implies that the elements in $\mathcal{A}$ are monic and have different classes, which means $\mathcal{A}$ is a monic triangular set.

Now let's prove the termination of **Triset**. It is sufficient to show that the loop of Step 2 is terminal. We prove this by induction. If $n = 1$, the termination is obvious. Now we assume when $n \leq k$, Loop 2 is terminal. When $n = k + 1$, we can prove that if no contradiction occurs, which means we don't obtain constant 1, we will convert all the polynomials with class $k+1$ into monic ones. Suppose the `Choose` function doesn't choose the polynomial with class $k+1$, then we will always deal with the polynomials with k variables. According to the hypothesis, we will find contradiction or achieve a monic polynomial set with different classes from these polynomials. If no contradiction occurs, then the `Choose` function have to choose the polynomial with class $k + 1$. The above procedure will repeat until all the polynomials with class $k + 1$ are converted into monic ones. Then, after executing `AddReduce`, $\mathbb{P}$ will have one polynomials with class $k + 1$, and it is monic. After that, we only need to deal with the polynomials with k variables, thus Loop 2 will terminate at last. □

Theorem 2 *Algorithm* **BCS** *is correct.*

Proof: According to Lemma 1, it is easy to check that if **BCS** terminates, the output is correct. Therefore, we only need to prove the termination of **BCS**.

For a polynomial set in $\mathbb{P}^*$, we assign an index $(t_n, r_n, t_{n-1}, r_{n-1}, \ldots, t_1, r_1)$, where t_i is the number of non-monic polynomials with class i in $\mathbb{P}^*$, and r_i is the number of polynomials with class i in $\mathbb{P}^*$. Then we order the indexes by lexicography. Now we will show that the index of any polynomial set in $\mathbb{Q}^*$ is strictly smaller than the index of $\mathbb{Q}$. It is sufficient to show that in **Triset**, the indexes of the updated $\mathbb{P}$ and the new generated $\mathbb{P}_1$ are smaller than the index of the previous $\mathbb{P}$.

First, let's consider the change of $\mathbb{P}$. $\mathbb{P}$ is updated in the following three cases.

1) We do the zero decomposition, and replace a non-monic polynomial $Ix_c + U$ by $x_c + U$ and $I + 1$. In this case, t_c, the number of non-monic polynomial with class c, decrease by 1, thus the index decrease.

2) We execute `AddReduce`. Consider the monic polynomials with highest class c. Obviously, after `AddReduce`, t_c will not be change, and r_c will decrease. Thus, the index of $\mathbb{P}$ will decrease.

3) We execute `Simplify`. Suppose we obtain a linear polynomial $x_c + l$. For the monic polynomials $x_k + U$, where $k > c$, substituting x_c with L will not change it into a non-monic polynomial. Moreover, the number of polynomials with class $k > c$ will not increase. Hence, for $k > c$, t_k, r_k will not increase. We know that $t_c, r_c = 0$ after `Simplify`. Hence, the index of $\mathbb{P}$ will decrease.

For the new generated $\mathbb{P}_1$, we replace some polynomial $Ix_c + U$ with I, U. It is obvious that t_c decreases and r_c decreases, thus the index decreases.

It is easy to show that a strictly decreasing sequence of indexes must be finite. This proves the termination of **BCS**. □

3. The complexity of BCS

In this section, we will estimate the complexity of **BCS**. In order to do this, we introduce the conception of zero decomposition tree. We can generate *the zero decomposition tree* of **BCS** as follows.

I) First, let the root node to be the input polynomial system $\mathbb{P}$, and use a pointer $\mathcal{M}$ pointing to this node. The depth of the root node is set to be 0.

II) In the process of **Triset**, when we generate a new polynomial system at Step 21, we generate a new node, and set it to be this new polynomial system. Then let this node be the right child of the node pointed by $\mathcal{M}$. When we update the current polynomial system at Step 22, we generate a new node, and set it to be the updated polynomial system. Then let this node to be the left child of the node pointed by $\mathcal{M}$. After this, we let $\mathcal{M}$ point to the left child.

III) After we finished **Triset** one time, we will select a new polynomial set $\mathbb{Q}$ from $\mathbb{P}^*$ at Step 3 of **BCS** and run **Triset** again. At this time, we let $\mathcal{M}$ point to the node corresponding to $\mathbb{Q}$ and execute the operations in II) again.

We call an external path of this zero decomposition tree a *solving branch*. It is obvious that a solving branch is corresponding to one execution of **Triset**. Moreover, in this branch there is a node which is corresponding to the input of **Triset**. Obviously, when the solving branch is corresponding to first execution of **Triset**, this node is the root node. Otherwise, this node is the last node which is the right child of some node on this path. Moreover, we call the *initial depth* of a solving branch to be the depth of this node.

Based on the zero decomposition tree, we can estimate the complexity of **BCS** by combing the complexity of **Triset** and the number of solving branches. First, let's show the complexity of solving one branch.

3.1. The complexity of Triset

Lemma 3 *For a polynomial system* $\mathbb{P} = \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m\} \in \mathbb{F}_2[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ *with* $\mathrm{tdeg}(f_i) \leq d$ *and a linear polynomial* $x_c + L$ *with class* c*. The bit-size complexity of substitute all* x_c *with* L *in* $\mathbb{P}$ *is* $O(dmn^{d+2}log(n))$*.*

Proof: A polynomial f_i can be written as $P_1x_c + P_2$. Then the substitution process of this polynomial is computing $P_1L + P_2$. Since $\mathrm{tdeg}(f_i) \leq d$, $\mathrm{tdeg}(P_1) \leq d-1$ and $\mathrm{tdeg}(P_2) \leq d$. Moreover, we know that P_1 and P_2 have at most $n-1$ variables, thus P_1 has at most $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\binom{n-1}{i}$ terms and P_2 has at most $\sum_{i=0}^{d}\binom{n}{i}$ terms. L is a linear polynomial with at most $n-1$ terms. For computing P_1L, we need to do at most $(n-1)\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\binom{n-1}{i}$ times of monomial multiplications. For two Boolean polynomial with $n-1$ variables, the multiplication of two monomial is equal to the addition of two vectors with $n-1$ dimension, thus we need $n-1$ operations. Thus, we need $(n-1)^2\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\binom{n-1}{i}$ operations to achieve the monomials of P_1L. To compute P_1L, we need to sum up all these monomials, and the complexity of this process is equal to the complexity of sorting all these monomials, which is $(n-1)((n-1)\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\binom{n-1}{i})\log((n-1)\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\binom{n-1}{i}) = O(dn^{d+2}\log(n))$.

Note that , P_1L and P_2 are two polynomials whose terms have been sorted, thus the complexity of P_1L plus P_2 is $2(n-1)\sum_{i=0}^{d}\binom{n-1}{i} = O(n^{d+1})$. Then, the complexity of computing $P_1L + P_2$ is $O(dn^{d+2}\log(n)) + O(n^{d+1}) = O(dn^{d+2}\log(\mathrm{n}))$. Hence, the complexity of m times of substitution is $O(dmn^{d+2}\log(\mathrm{n}))$. □

We define $\mathrm{tdeg}(\mathbb{P})$, the degree of a polynomial system $\mathbb{P}$, to be the highest total degree of the elements in $\mathbb{P}$. Let k be an integer and P be a polynomial. Write $P = Ix_k + U$ as a univariate polynomial in x_k. We define two operators $\mathcal{R}_k$ and $\mathcal{J}_k$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{R}_k(P) = U, \mathcal{J}_k(P) = I + 1 \text{ if } \mathrm{cls}(P) = k. \quad \mathcal{R}_k(P) = P, \mathcal{J}_k(P) = 0 \text{ if } \mathrm{cls}(P) < k. \quad (1)$$

Theorem 4 *Let* $\mathbb{P} = \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_m\}$ *be the input polynomial system of* **Triset***, and* $tdeg(\mathbb{P}) = d$*. For any* `Choose` *function, the bit-size complexity of* **TriSet** *is* $O(dmn^{2d+3}\log(n))$*. Then when* d *is fixed,* **TriSet** *is a polynomial-time algorithm with respect to* n*.*

Proof: It is sufficient that we prove the theorem in the worse case, which is the input polynomials are all with class n, and when we deal with a polynomial $Ix_c + R$ with class c in the algorithm, I and R are all with class $c-1$.

We denote the number of polynomials with class c occurring in the whole procedure of the algorithm by M_c, and the input polynomial set by $\mathbb{S}$. First, we assume we don't use the `Simplify` function in the algorithm. For class n, obviously $M_n = m$. For class $n-1$, the polynomials can be grouped into the following two polynomial sets:

$$\mathbb{S}_J = \{\mathcal{J}_n(P)|P \in \mathbb{S}\}, \mathbb{S}_R = \{\mathcal{R}_n(P_s + P)|P \in \mathbb{S}\},$$

where $P_s \in \mathbb{S}$ is the polynomial chosen in Step 3 of `AddReduce`. Obviously, P_s is a polynomial with class n and $\text{tdeg}(P_s) \leq \text{tdeg}(P)$. Note that P_s may not be a fixed polynomial[1].

Thus, we have $|\mathbb{S}_J| \leq m$, $|\mathbb{S}_R| \leq m$, $\text{tdeg}(\mathbb{S}_J) \leq d-1$ and $\text{tdeg}(\mathbb{S}_R) \leq d$,

For class $n-2$, the polynomials can be sorted into the following four polynomial sets:

$$\mathbb{S}_{JJ} = \{\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(P)|P \in \mathbb{S}_J\}, \mathbb{S}_{RR} = \{\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(P_s + P)|P \in \mathbb{S}_R\}$$
$$\mathbb{S}_{JR} = \{\mathcal{J}_{n-1}(P)|P \in \mathbb{S}_R\}, \mathbb{S}_{RJ} = \{\mathcal{R}_{n-1}(P_s + P)|P \in \mathbb{S}_J\}$$

Similarly, we have $|\mathbb{S}_{JJ}|, |\mathbb{S}_{RR}|, |\mathbb{S}_{JR}|, |\mathbb{S}_{RJ}| \leq m$. Since $\text{tdeg}(P_s) \leq P$, we have $\text{tdeg}(\mathbb{S}_{JJ}) \leq d-2$, $\text{tdeg}(\mathbb{S}_{JR}) \leq d-1$, $\text{tdeg}(\mathbb{S}_{RJ}) \leq d-1$ and $\text{tdeg}(\mathbb{S}_{RR}) \leq d$

Recursively, we have the polynomials with class $n-k$ can be sorted into the polynomial sets which have form $\mathbb{S}_{O_1O_2\cdots O_k}$, where O_i is J or R. We have $|\mathbb{S}_{O_1O_2\cdots O_k}| \leq m$ and $\text{tdeg}(\mathbb{S}_{O_1O_2\cdots O_k}) \leq d-s$, where s is number of J in these subscripts O_i. Since the total degree of $\mathbb{S}_{O_1O_2\cdots O_k}$ must be higher than 0, we have $s \leq d-1$. Therefore, we have $M_{n-k} \leq m(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\binom{k}{i})$. Then the total number of polynomials occurring in the whole algorithm, which is denoted by N_m, is less than $m\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1}\binom{k}{i}) = m\sum_{j=1}^{d}\binom{n}{j} = O(mn^d)$.

It is easy to see that if we use the `Simplify` function in the algorithm, M_{n-k} will not increase. Note that, the major operations in the algorithm is addition of two monic polynomials and substitution x_c with a linear polynomial in `Simplify`. Thus, we need to analyze the complexity of these two kinds of operations.

- When we execute the substitution in `Simplify` one time, we will eliminate one variable, thus this process can be executed at most n times. Each time, the number of polynomials that we need to do the substitution is less than $O(mn^d)$. Hence, according to Lemma 3, the complexity of executing `Simplify` n times is $O(dmn^{2d+3}\log(n))$

- For each class c, the addition of two monic polynomials will convert one of them into a polynomial with lower class, thus the number of addition operations is bounded by M_c. Hence, the number of addition operations in the whole algorithm is bound by $N_m \leq O(mn^d)$. Moreover, the addition of two polynomials with degree d has a bit-size complexity $O(n^{d+1})$. Thus, the bit-size complexity of the addition operations in the algorithm is bounded by $O(mn^{2d+1})$.

[1] In **MFCS** of (Gao and Huang, 2012), this P_s is always fixed.

In summary, the bit-size complexity of **Triset** is $O(mn^{2d+1}) + O(dmn^{2d+3}\log(n)) = O(dmn^{2d+3}\log(n))$. □

3.2. The depth of the zero decomposition tree when solving quadratic polynomial systems

In this section, we will estimate the depth of the zero decomposition tree for quadratic systems. Quadratic Boolean polynomial systems are typical nonlinear systems, and the problem of solving them is called MQ problem. To the best of the authors' knowledge, the best complexity result for solving this problem is $O(2^{0.841n})$ when $m = n$ under some precise algebraic assumptions which are satisfied with probability very close to 1 (Bardet et al., 2013). If no assumption is made for the system, the best complexity result is $O(4log_2(n)2^n)$ for the fast exhaustive search method proposed in (Bouillaguet et al., 2010).

First, we show a simple result about the depth of the zero decomposition tree for quadratic systems. Note that, each time we generate a new branch, we do the zero decomposition $\text{Zero}(Ix_c + U) = \text{Zero}(x_c + U, I + 1) \cup \text{Zero}(I, U)$ w.r.t. some polynomial $Ix_c + U$. Since the input system is quadratic, $I + 1$ and I are both linear. Hence, in the current branch and the new generated branch, we both have a new linear polynomial. Then, by `Simplify`, we can eliminate one variable by the linear polynomial. Therefore, this can only happen n times, which means the depth of the tree is bounded by n. Then the number of branches is bounded by 2^n

In the following of this section, we will show that when the input quadratic polynomial system is a random system, the depth of the zero decomposition can be bounded by $n - 3$ when n is big enough. From the view of computational complexity, the effect of this smaller bound can be ignored. However, this bound can be used to analyze the randomness of a quadratic system by the method proposed in Section 4.4 . Moreover, from the proof of the result, we can better illuminate how **BCS** works.

For `Simplify`, if its output is either two empty sets, or a triangular set $\mathcal{A}$ and an empty set, where the elements in $\mathcal{A}$ are linear polynomials, then we say that `Simplify` outputs a terminal result.

Lemma 5 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a random quadratic polynomial system with 4 variables and m elements. Suppose r polynomials in $\mathbb{P}$ have the form $x_4 + g_i(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, where g_i is a random quadratic polynomial. Let $\mathcal{L} = x_3 + L(x_1, x_2)$, where L is a random linear polynomial. Let $P_b = P_1 + (1 - P_1)(P_2 + P_3)$, where $P_1 = (1 - (1/2)^r)(1 - (9/16)^{m-1})$, $P_2 = 1 - (121/128)^{m-r}$, $P_3 = (121/128)^{m-r}(1 - (8/121)^{m-r})(1 - (9/16)^{m-1})$. If we execute `Simplify` with input $\mathbb{P} \cup \{\mathcal{L}\}$, then with the probability P_b, we will achieve a terminal result.*

Proof: Since $\mathcal{L}$ is linear, we will substitute x_3 with $L(x_1, x_2)$. After we substitute x_3 with $L(x_1, x_2)$ in $\mathbb{P}$, we will achieve r polynomials with the form $x_4 + g'_i(x_1, x_2)$ and $m - r$ polynomials with the form $t'_j(x_1, x_2)x_4 + g'_j(x_1, x_2)$.

Case (a): We continue the substitution process with some $x_4 + g'_i(x_1, x_2)$ being linear. Note that $\text{tdeg}(g'_i) \leq 2$, thus the probability of g'_i being a linear polynomial or a constant is $2^{\binom{2}{1}+1}/2^{\binom{2}{2}+\binom{2}{1}+1} = 1/2$. Thus, the probability of some g'_i being a linear polynomial or a

constant is $1-(1/2)^r$, and then x_4+g_i' will be a linear polynomial. Furthermore, we can substitute x_4 with g_i' in other $m-1$ polynomials, and achieve $m-1$ polynomials with at most 2 variables.

- If one of them is a linear polynomial, after we doing the substitution with this polynomial, we can convert other polynomials into constants or linear polynomials with one variable, thus `Simplify` will output a terminal result.
- If one of them is the constant 1, `Simplify` will end and output two empty sets.

The probability of the above two cases happening is $1-(9/16)^{m-1}$. Thus, in Case (a), with probability $P_1=(1-(1/2)^r)(1-(9/16)^{m-1})$, `Simplify` will output a terminal result.
Case (b): Case (a) is not valid, and we continue the substitution process with some $t'(x_1,x_2)x_4+g_i'(x_1,x_2)$ being linear.

- It is easy to check that with probability $P_2=1-(121/128)^{m-r}$, we can find some $t'(x_1,x_2)x_4+g_i'(x_1,x_2)$ such that $t'=0$ and g_i' is linear or constant 1. Let's show that in this case `Simplify` will output a terminal result. When some g_i' is constant 1, the conclusion is obvious. When some g_i' is linear, we can assume the class of this g_i' is 2. Then after substitution, we can achieve r linear polynomials with class 4 and having two variables x_4,x_1, and $m-r$ quadratic polynomials with variables x_4,x_1. Then, we can eliminate x_4 in other polynomials and convert these into constants or linear polynomials with variable x_1. Hence, `Simplify` will output a terminal result.
- If the above case doesn't occur, and some $t'(x_1,x_2)x_4+g_i'(x_1,x_2)$ is linear or a constant with $t'=1$, then we can substitute x_4 with g_i', and achieve $m-1$ polynomials with at most two variables. Furthermore, if one of these $m-1$ polynomials is linear or constant 1, `Simplify` will output a terminal result. Similarly as above, the probability of this process succeeding is $P_3=(121/128)^{m-r}(1-(8/121)^{m-r})(1-(9/16)^{m-1})$

  In summary, in Case (b), with probability P_2+P_3, `Simplify` will output a terminal result.

By combining Case (a) and (b), we know that with probability $P_1+(1-P_1)(P_2+P_3)$, `Simplify` will output a terminal result. □

Lemma 6 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a random quadratic polynomial system with 7 variables and m elements. Suppose r polynomials in $\mathbb{P}$ have the form $x_7+g_i(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5,x_6)$, where g_i is a random quadratic polynomial. Let $\mathcal{L}=x_6+L(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5)$, where L is a random linear polynomial. Let $P_r=(1-(1-1/2^{10})^{m+r-1}+1-((2^{22}-2^7+1)/2^{22})^{m-r}$ If we execute `Simplify` with input $\mathbb{P}\cup\{\mathcal{L}\}$, then the probability of `Simplify` outputting a terminal result is smaller than P_r.*

Proof: Since $\mathcal{L}$ is linear, we substitute x_6 with L. If after substitution, we cannot achieve a new linear polynomial, `Simplify` will not output a terminal result.

Case (a): We continue the substitution process with some x_7+g_i' being linear. The probability of some g_i' being linear is $1-(1-1/2^{10})^r$. Then we can substitute x_7. After

substitution, the probability of we achieving a new linear polynomial or the constant 1 is $1-(1-1/2^{10})^{m-1}$. Thus, P_1, the probability of `Simplify` output a terminal result in Case (a), is smaller than $(1-(1-1/2^{10})^{m+r-1}$.

Case (b): Case (a) is not valid, and we continue the substitution with the some $t'x_7+g'$ being linear. The probability of one of them being constant 1 or linear is $1-((2^{22}-2^7+1)/2^{22})^{m-r}$. Thus, P_2, the probability of `Simplify` outputting a terminal result in Case (b), is smaller than $1-((2^{22}-2^7+1)/2^{22})^{m-r}$.

We have the probability of `Simplify` outputting a terminal result is $P_1+(1-P_1)P_2 \leq P_1+P_2 \leq (1-(1-1/2^{10})^{m+r-1}+1-((2^{22}-2^7+1)/2^{22})^{m-r}=P_r$.

□

Lemma 7 *Let f be a random quadratic polynomial with k variables. The probability of f being a linear polynomial is $1/2^{\binom{n}{2}+1}$, and the probability of f being constant 1 or 0 is $1/2^{\binom{n}{2}+\binom{n}{1}+1}$*

Proof: The proof is obvious. □

Lemma 8 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a random quadratic polynomial system with $17 \leq n \leq 100$ variables and $m=n$ polynomials. Let d be the depth of the first solving branch of* **BCS**$(\mathbb{P})$*. Assume t, the threshold value in Step 6 of* **BCS***, is set to be ∞. Then we have $n-5 \leq d \leq n-3$ with probability close to 1.*

Proof: The conclusion is equal to that the probability of $d \leq n-6$ and $d \geq n-2$ is close to 0. Obviously, it is sufficient to show the probability of $d=n-6$ or $d=n-2$ is close to 0. Note that, since $t=\infty$, we do the `AddReduce` until we have converted all the polynomials into monic ones.

Firstly, we assume $d=n-6$, which means we do the zero decomposition $n-6$ times. Since $m=n$, we still have non-monic polynomials after $n-6$ times of zero decompositions. Therefore, we will not execute `AddReduce` and the only possibility of this branch ending is `Simplify` output a terminal result. For a polynomial Ix_c+U which is not monic, since it is quadratic, we have $I+1$ is a linear polynomial. Thus, each time we achieve a $I+1$, we will do the substitution of `Simplify` one time, and eliminate one variable. From Lemma 7, we know that when $k \leq n-7$, the probability of a polynomial with $n-k$ variables being linear or constant 1 can be ignored. Hence, after we do the zero decomposition $n-6$ times, we will achieve a linear polynomial, and some quadratic polynomials. Without loss of generality, this linear polynomial can be written as $x_6+L(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5)$. In these quadratic polynomials, $n-6$ of them are monic and have the form $x_n+g_i(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4,x_5,x_6)$. By Lemma 6, we know that the probability of `Simplify` output a terminal result with these polynomials as input, is less than $P_r=(1-(1-1/2^{10})^{n-6})(1-(1-1/2^{10})^{m-1})+1-((2^{22}-2^7+1)/2^{22})^6$. When $m=17$, $P_r=0.3\%$, and when $m=100$, $P_r=1.3\%$. Then we know that the probability of `Simplify` outputting a terminal result in this case is close to 0.

Secondly, we already do the zero decomposition $n-3$ times. Similarly as the analysis above, in this case, we will achieve a linear polynomial $x_3+L(x_1,x_2)$ and $n-3$ quadratic polynomial with the form $x_n+g_i(x_1,x_2,x_3)$. By Lemma 5, we know that the probability

of `Simplify` outputting a terminal result with these polynomials as input is bigger than 99.9999%, which is close to 1. Thus, the probability of $d = n - 2$ is close to 0. □

In the above theorem, we estimate the depth of the first solving branch when $t = \infty$. If we consider other branches or set the threshold value $t \neq \infty$, the conclusion is still valid. Note that, in these cases, at depth k, we will not have exactly k polynomials with the form $x_n + U$. The reason is that some x_n may be eliminated in the `AddReduce` process, or we are dealing the branch generated by I, U after the zero decomposition of $Ix_c + U$. The conclusion in these cases can be similarly proved by modifying the above proof slightly. Then, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 9 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a random quadratic polynomial system with $17 \leq n \leq 100$ variables and $m = n$ polynomials. Let d be the depth of a solving branch of* **BCS**$(\mathbb{P})$. *Then we have $n - 5 \leq d \leq n - 3$ with probability close to 1.*

From the proof of above lemmas, we can observe the following fact: when n is fixed, if m increases, the probability of a branch having a lower depth will increase. Based on this analysis, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 10 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a random quadratic polynomial system with $n \geq 17$ variables and $m \geq n$ polynomials. Let d be the depth of a solving branch of* **BCS**$(\mathbb{P})$. *Then we have $d \leq n - 3$ with probability close to 1.*

In the follows, we present some experimental results to verify the above theoretical results. In these experiments, we generated some random quadratic polynomials, in which the probability of a monomial occurring is 1/2, and solved them by **BCS**. In Table 1, n is the number of variables, m is the number of polynomials, d_a is the average depth, and n_b is the number of branches. For $d = n - i, 2 \leq i \leq 7$, we list the percentage of the number of branches with depth d.

Table 1: Solving random quadratic system

n	m	d_a	n_b	$d = n-7$	$d = n-6$	$d = n-5$	$d = n-4$	$d = n-3$	$d = n-2$
20	20	15.75	$2^{15.57}$	0.17%	2.94%	30.00%	55.32%	11.53%	0.00%
	100	15.41	$2^{15.24}$	0.34%	6.88%	46.08%	44.93%	1.73%	0.00%
	500	15.14	$2^{14.98}$	0.66%	13.72%	55.90%	29.66%	0.00%	0.00%
23	23	18.78	$2^{18.64}$	0.03%	1.60%	27.18%	62.54%	8.64%	0.00%
	100	18.73	$2^{18.63}$	0.00%	0.73%	26.65%	70.10%	2.52%	0.00%
	500	18.43	$2^{18.33}$	0.00%	1.96%	53.23%	44.81%	0.00%	0.00%

From the experimental results, we can observe that $n - 6 \leq d_a \leq n - 3$ is valid for these systems, and d_a decreases with m increasing.

3.3. The complexity bound of **BCS**

In this section we will present the complexity bound of **BCS** in different cases. First, we consider the quadratic polynomial systems. In this case, from the definition of initial depth, we can know that the complexity of solving a branch with higher initial depth is smaller. Based on this observation, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 11 *Let $\mathbb{P}_1$ be the system corresponding to a branch with initial depth d_0 and depth d. Suppose the input of* **BCS** *is a quadratic polynomial system with n variables and m polynomials. Then the bit-size complexity of* **Triset**$(\mathbb{P}_1)$ *is $O((m+d)(n-d_0+1)^5\log(n-d_0+1)))$.*

Proof: It is obvious that after one time of zero decomposition, the number of polynomials in this branch will increase by one. Therefore, at any step of **Triset**, the number of polynomials in this branch is always less than $m+d$.

Since the initial depth of this branch is d_0, we have eliminated d_0-1 variables before solving this branch. Thus, in the `Simplify` process, we can do the substitution $n-d_0+1$ times, and the complexity is $O((m+d)(n-d_0+1)^5\log(n-d_0+1))$ according to Lemma 3.

Now let us estimate the complexity of addition operations. The complexity of adding two quadratic polynomials with $n-d_0$ variables is $O((n-d_0)^3)$. For each class, the number of polynomials is less than $m+d$, and the number of different classes is at most $n-d_0$. Therefore the number of additions is less than $(n-d_0)(m+d)$, and the complexity of addition operations is $O((n-d_0)^4(m+d))$. Then, the complexity of **Triset** is $O((m+d)(n-d_0+1)^5\log(n-d_0+1))) + O((n-d_0)^4(m+d)) = O((m+d)(n-d_0+1)^5\log(n-d_0+1)))$. □

Lemma 12 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a quadratic polynomial system with n variables and m polynomials. If the depth of the branches of* **BCS**$(\mathbb{P})$ *are all d, then the bit-size complexity of* **BCS**$(\mathbb{P})$ *is bounded by*

1) $O((d+1)(m+d)2^{d-1}(n-d+1)^6)$, when $d < n-9.66$.

2) $O((d+1)(m+d)2^n)$, when $d \geq n-9.66$.

Proof: For a solving branch with depth d, except the root node there are d nodes in this branch. They can form a sequence $\{E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_d\}$, where $E_i = L$ or R, which means the i-th node is a left child or a right child respectively. For example, the node sequence of the first branch is $\{L, L, \ldots, L\}$. Then, the node sequence for a branch with initial depth $d_0 > 0$, must have the form

$$\{E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_{d_0-1}, R, \underbrace{L, L, \ldots, L}_{d-d_0}\},$$

where $E_i, 1 \leq i \leq d_0-1$ can be either L or R. Thus, the number of branches with initial depth d_0 is at most 2^{d_0-1}. According to Lemma 11, the bit-size complexity of **Triset** is $O((m+d)(n-d_0+1)^5\log(n-d_0+1))) \leq O((m+d)(n-d_0+1)^6$. Then, the complexity of **BCS** is bounded by $(m+d)(n^6 + \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2^{k-1}(n-k+1)^6)$. Function $2^{x-1}(n-x+1)^6$

reaches its maximal value when $x = n - 6/\log 2 + 1 = n - 9.66$. Thus, if $d < n - 9.66$, $(m+d)(2n^6 + \sum_{i=1}^{d} 2^{k-1}m(n-k+1)^6)) \leq O((d+1)(m+d)2^{d-1}(n-d+1)^6)$.

If $d \geq n - 9.66$, $(m+d)(2n^6 + \sum_{k=1}^{d} 2^{k-1}(n-k+1)^6 \leq (d+1)(m+d)2^{n-9.66}(9.66)^8 = O((d+1)(m+d)2^n)$ □

Based on Lemma 12 and Theorem 10, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 13 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a random quadratic polynomial system with n variables and m polynomials. The bit-size complexity of* **BCS**$(\mathbb{P})$ *is bounded by $O(n(m+n)2^{n-3})$.*

When the degree of the polynomial system is higher than 2, we have the following theorem about the complexity bound of **BCS**.

Theorem 14 *Let $\mathbb{P}$ be a random polynomial system with degree d. If the polynomial chosen by* `Choose` *always has the lowest degree, then the bit-size complexity of* **BCS($\mathbb{P}$)** *is bounded by $O(2^{(n-1)(d-1)}dmn^{d+2}log(n))$.*

Proof: Suppose we choose a polynomial $P_1 = Ix_c + U$ with degree d at the zero decomposition step of **BCS**, then we will add $I+1$ into the current branch and $\{I, U\}$ into the new generated branch. Note that, $\deg(I) \leq \deg(P) - 1 = d - 1$. Since P_1 is a random polynomial, we can assume that I is not monic. It means that there is a non-monic polynomial with degree not larger than $d-1$ in any of the two branches. Hence, at next step, when we choose a new polynomial P_2 in any of the two branches, we have $\deg(P_2) \leq d-1$, since P_2 has the lowest degree. Similarly, after do the zero decomposition w.r.t. P_2, we will add a polynomial with degree not larger than $d-2$ into the current branch and the new generated branch. After do the above operation $d-1$ times, we will generate a linear polynomial. Then, by `Simplify`, we can eliminate one variable. This means the depth of any branch is not larger than $(d-1)(n-1)$. Hence, the number of branches is bounded by $2^{(d-1)(n-1)}$. Then, according to Theorem 4, we have the complexity of **BCS** is bounded by $O(2^{(n-1)(d-1)}dmn^{d+2}log(n))$. □

4. New features of BCS

4.1. The `Choose` function

From extensive experiments, we found that different `Choose` functions will significantly affect the efficiency of **BCS**. Hence, a vital problem for improving the efficiency of **BCS** is to find an appropriate `Choose` function.

Intuitively, a major principle for a good `Choose` function is

Choosing the "easy" polynomials first, and using the linear polynomials, which are generated from the zero decomposition of these "easy" polynomials, to simplify the "hard" polynomials.

Under this principle, we should order the polynomials from "easy" to "hard", and always choose the polynomial with the minimal order. Here we proposed a choosing strategy that

has good performances on solving most systems. For a polynomial $P = Ix_c + U$, we define an index

$$(\deg(P), term(I), term(U), \mathrm{cls}(P))$$

where $term(P)$ is the number of monomials in P. Then we choose the polynomial with smallest index in the lexicographical ordering.

We explain the idea of this choosing strategy.

- According to the proof of Theorem 14, we know that by choosing the polynomial with the lowest degree, we can ensure the degree of the chosen polynomial decreases, then generate the linear polynomial earlier. Thus, the first coordinate of this index is $\deg(P)$.
- Note that, when dealing with a polynomial with small number of monomials, we will more likely achieve linear polynomials in the following process earlier, then simplify other polynomials[2]. In the step of zero decomposition for $P = Ix_c + U$, we add I into the current branch and $I + 1$ into the new generated branch, thus the size of I will affect the following process of these two branches. In the current branch, another new polynomial is $x_c + U$, which is monic and will not be chosen at next step, thus the size of U will only affect the following process of the new generated branch. Therefore, we first consider I and then U.
- For a linear polynomial $x_c + L$, if c is larger than the class of another polynomial, we cannot substitute x_c with L in this polynomial. Hence, we have to choose the polynomial with low class such that the linear polynomials generated can be used to simplify more polynomials.

Based on this `Choose` function, we used **BCS** to solve some benchmarks in (Gao and Huang, 2012). This benchmarks are originated from stream cipher based on LFSR and a filter function, and have the form

$$\begin{aligned} &f(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \\ &f(L(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)) \\ &f(L^2(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)) \\ &\ldots \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where L is linear polynomial and f is a nonlinear polynomial. In the following, Canfil 1 to Canfil 8 are corresponding to different nonlinear polynomials (Canteaut and Filiol, 2000).

In Table 2, we compared the numbers of solving branches of **BCS** with those of **MFCS** in Table 5 of (Gao and Huang, 2012). We remind the reader that the simplification skill of using linear polynomial was already used in the implementation of **MFCS**, which is not mentioned in (Gao and Huang, 2012). Hence, the differences of the numbers of branches for

[2]This is observed from our experiments. We don't have a theoretical proof yet.

these two algorithms are due to the different `Choose` functions. Note that the the choosing strategy used in the implementation of **MFCS** is as mentioned in Remark 1. The following experimental results show that with the above `Choose` function, we reduced the numbers of branches for all these benchmarks except Canfil 7.

Table 2: The number of branches for solving Canfil Problems

	Canfil 1	Canfil 2	Canfil 3	Canfil 4	Canfil 5	Canfil 6	Canfil 7	Canfi 8
BCS	11958	16074	3267	1316	574	671	1852	35547
MFCS	13749	23881	7251	1657	1086	3331	1551	180710

4.2. The threshold value t

In Step 6 of **Triset**, we set a threshold value t. When the number of monic polynomials in the current branch exceeds t, we use `AddReduce` to eliminate the leading variables of some polynomials. The purpose of using this threshold value is to obtain linear polynomials and contradictions earlier. Since the monic polynomials are generated from the ones chosen by `Choose`, they are always "simplier" than other polynomials. Therefore, by executing `AddReduce` for these monic polynomials, we can generate some new "simply" polynomials which are not monic, then maybe obtain linear polynomials earlier.

For some systems, by using a small threshold value t, we can significantly reduce the number of branches. For instance, we consider the benchmarks generated by Canfil 8 in (Chai et al., 2008; Gao and Huang, 2012). The polynomials in this system have the form similar to

$$\begin{aligned} &x_1x_2x_3 + x_2x_3x_6 + x_1x_2 + x_3x_4 + x_5x_6 + x_4 + x_5 \\ =&(x_5 + x_2x_3)x_6 + x_5 + x_4 + x_3x_4 + x_1x_2x_3 + x_1x_2 \end{aligned}$$

We can observe that in this system for a polynomial $P = Ix_c + U$, I and U are both monic polynomials. Suppose we don't set a threshold value t. After we decompose the first polynomial P, the new polynomials added into the current branch and the new generated branch are all monic. Then, in next time of zero decomposition for these two branches, we will choose another input polynomial. Note that, the above situation will occur repeatedly. It means that by any `Choose` function, we will always choose the input polynomial, so the depth of the zero decomposition tree will be equal to the number of input polynomials m, and the number of branches will be 2^m. Hence, in this case, when $m \geq 40$, solving this system in practical time is impossible.

In (Chai et al., 2008; Gao and Huang, 2012), the idea of threshold value t is not used, so the benchmarks generated by Candil 8 cannot be solved directly. In order to solve this system, some special skill were added, in (Chai et al., 2008), some polynomials with lower degree, which are generated from the annihilators of the nonlinear filter function (Courtois and Meier, 2003), were added into the system, and in (Gao and Huang, 2012) we changed the order of the variables and destroied the above special form of the input polynomials.

4.3. The efficiency of **BCS** *when* m *increases*

From the analysis and experiments of solving quadratic polynomial systems in Section 3, we can know that, for quadratic polynomial systems, N_b, the number of branches, will decrease when m increases. Actually, for most systems, this always happens. The reason is as follows.

- If the new added polynomials are more complicated than the former polynomials, they will not be chosen by the `Choose` function, thus it will not change the order of zero decomposition. They can be used to provide new contradictions in the `Simplify` and `Addreduce` processes, so some solving branch may be cut off earlier.

- If the new added polynomials are simpler than the former polynomials, `Choose` will choose these simpler polynomials to do zero decomposition, and in most cases, choosing simpler polynomials will lead to less solving branches.

Moreover, there is a way to ensure that the number of branches decreases when m increases for any polynomial systems. That is we use a `Choose` function which preferentially chooses the former polynomial and the polynomials generated from the former polynomials.

Then, a natural question is whether we can improve the efficiency of **BCS** by adding some new polynomials. This problem is originated from cryptanalysis, in which we can generate infinite number of polynomials to find a unique solution in most cases.

As shown in Theorem 4, when m increases, the complexity of solving one branch will increase. Hence, the efficiency of **BCS** will be improved when $N_{new}C_{new} < NC$, where N is the numbers of branches, and C is the complexity of solving one branch.

Here, we present some instants that the running time is shortened when m increases. We conclude that this may happen when the new added input polynomials have the close size as the former input polynomials and can easily provide contradictions in the simplify process. The first property keeps the complexity of solving one branch will not increase to much, and the second property makes the number of branches decrease greatly.

1) The first instance is from the above stream cipher problem. In the following graph, we illustrate the changes of the number of branches and the total running time when m increases for Canfil 7 problem with $n = 64$.





From the first figure, we can observe that N_b, the number of branches, decreases dramatically when m is not too big. For m from 80 to 110, N_b decreases slowly, and its value is about 50000 to 60000.

From the second figure, we can observe that the running time decreases when $m \leq 55$, and when $m = 55$ it reaches its minimal value which is 19.21 seconds. Then, since the change of N_b is small, the things which can affect the total running time is the number and the size of the new added polynomials. According to formula 2 in Section 4.1, since the composition of linear polynomial L, the input polynomials will be more and more complicated as m increases. Hence, for m from 80 to 110, the running time behaves like a polynomial function.

2) The second instance is a more typical one, in which by adding one polynomial with the same size as the former polynomials, we can greatly reduce the number of branches. This instance is originated from the Boolean matrix multiplication problem. For two $k \times k$ Boolean matrices A and B, if $AB = I$, by the linear algebra we can deduce that $BA = I$, where I is the $k \times k$ identity matrix. However, if we want to check the conclusion by reasoning, it will become an extremely difficult problem. This challenge problem was proposed by Stephen Cook in his invited talk at SAT 2004 (Cook, 2004; Cook and Nguyen, 2010). Before (Gao and Huang, 2012), the best known result was that the problem with $k = 5$ can be solved by SAT-solvers in about 800-2000 seconds. In (Gao and Huang, 2012), the problem with $k = 6$ was first time solved by **MFCS** in 196440 seconds.

We show that the original problem can be converted into the problem of solving of a Boolean polynomial system. By setting the entries of A and B to be $2k^2$ distinct variables, then we can obtain k^2 quadratic polynomials from $AB = I$. Then we compute the zero decomposition of this polynomials, and check whether the polynomials generated from $BA = I$ can be reduced to 0 by every triangular set in the zero decomposition. In this way, we can prove the conclusion. Precisely, let $\mathbb{P}_1$ and $\mathbb{P}_2$ be the polynomial sets generated by $AB = I$ and $BA = I$ respectively. With the CS method, we have

$$\text{Zero}(\mathbb{P}_1) = \cup_i \text{Zero}(\mathcal{A}_i)$$

where $\mathcal{A}_i$ are triangular sets. If $\text{prem}(P, \mathcal{A}_i) = 0$ for all possible i and $P \in \mathbb{P}_2$, then we have solved the problem. It is clear that the major difficulty here is to compute the zero

decomposition.

The above method was used in (Gao and Huang, 2012). Actually, there is another way to prove the correctness of the conclusion. For each polynomial g generated form $BA = I$, if we add $g+1$ into $\mathbb{P}_1$ and prove that we cannot achieve solution from such system, then we prove the conclusion. By this way, we can cutoff a lot of branches when solving the system and the complexity of solving one branch is almost unchanged. The following table present the compare of the running time of solving these two kinds of systems. We can see that, by adding one polynomial $g + 1$, we reduce about 30% of the branches, hence reduce the running time.

	Time	Branches
Solving $\{\mathbb{P}_1\}$	166.15 sec	1271549
Solving $\{\mathbb{P}_1, g + 1\}$	57.12 sec	899538

Table 3: Running times for Boolean matrix multiplication problems

Remark 2 *We mention that the result for solving* $\mathbb{P}_1$ *here is 166.15 seconds, which is much better than the result 196440 seconds in (Gao and Huang, 2012).*

4.4. Predicting the running time of **BCS**

In Section 3, we use the depth of the zero decomposition tree to estimate the number of branches, then by combining the complexity of solving one branch, we obtain the complexity of the algorithm. A natural idea is that whether we can use this method to predict the running time of **BCS** by only solving a part of branches. According to our experiments, we found that for a lot of polynomial systems, this method is valid.

Specifically, we need to execute **BCS** twice in different order of selecting solving branches. At the first time, we execute **BCS** by preferentially solving the branches with lowest initial depth. After we solved N branches, we will achieve an average depth d_a. At the second time, we execute **BCS** again by preferentially solving the branches with the highest initial depth. After we solved N branches we will achieve an average running time t_a. Then we predict the running time of **BCS** to be $t_a 2^{d_a}$. Note that, we preferentially solve the branches with low depth when we compute the average depth, while we preferentially solve the ones with high depth first when we compute the average running time. The reason is that when computing the average depth, we want to collect the depth information from the branches which can represent the algebraic structure of the system. In this case, consider the branches with low initial depth is more suitable. When computing the average running time, since the running time of solving branches with different initial depth is quite different. By preferentially solving the branches with low initial depth, in the first N branches, the number of the branches with low initial depth will be bigger than that of the branches with high initial depth, so the average running time will be more accurate.

In the the following table, we present some experimental results about the above method. Here, d_a is the average depth of the first 500 branches, t_a is the average running time of solving the first 500 branches. The predicted number of branches N_p is equal to 2^{d_a}, and N_r

is the true number of branches after **BCS** ends. The predicted running time T_p is equal to $N_p t_a$, and T_r is the true running time of **BCS**.

In these benchmarks,

- Random (n,n) is the random polynomial system with n variables and n polynomials.
- Matrix5 and Matrix6 is the above Boolean matrix multiplication problem with $k = 5, 6$, which have 50 variables and 72 variables respectively.
- Canfil7 is the system mentioned in last section with $m = 110$.
- Bivium-B is the reduced version of stream cipher Trivium which is selected as the eStream Portfolio. In our experiment, we considered the system of recovering the internal states of Bivium-B by keystream with 33 guessed bits (Huang and Lin, 2011).

Table 4: Solving random quadratic system

Benchmarks	d_a	t_a	N_p	N_r	T_p	T_r
Random (20,20)	15.9	$1.1 \cdot 10^{-4}$ s	61147	53719	7.02 s	4.66 s
Random (23,23)	18.8	$1.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ s	456419	418988	62.32 s	42.28 s
Matrix5	15.6	$3.6 \cdot 10^{-5} s$	46340	46021	1.68 s	1.08 s
Matrix6	20.9	$1.4 \cdot 10^{-4}$ s	1956712	1271549	273.94s	164.45s
Canfil7	15.7	$2.0 \cdot 10^{-3}$ s	53231	52125	106.46 s	78.89 s
Bivium-B	13.9	$4.2 \cdot 10^{-4}$ s	15286	28606	6.42 s	7.37 s

From the above experimental results, we can observe that our predicted running time is approximate to the true running time for these systems.

Remark 3 *From the experiments of solving some other systems, we found that when the system has some internal variables which is used to reduced the complexity of the representation of the system, our predicting method is not so accurate. This may happen when we try to solve some systems generated from block cipher. We think the reason is that in the solving process, the internal variables is not so important as the original variables, so the algebraic structure of different branches is quite different, which makes the distribution of depth is not uniform.*

Remark 4 *As we mentioned in Section 3.2, this method can be used to analyze the randomness of a quadratic polynomial system. Precisely, we can compute the average depth d_a of the input system for the first N branches. According to the experimental results in Table 1, we know that if d_a is nearly $n - 4$, the polynomial system is random in some sense.*

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we present an improved characteristic set algorithm **BCS** to solve Boolean polynomial systems. This algorithm is based on the algorithm **MFCS** and some important techniques applied in implementation. By analyzing the zero decomposition tree, we obtain some complexity bounds of **BCS**. Compared to the previous CS methods for solving boolean polynomial systems, **BCS** has the following important new features. **BCS** has a changeable `Choose` function, thus for different system, we can use different `Choose` function to improve its efficiency. In some cases, the efficiency of **BCS** can be improved by increasing the number of input polynomials. The running time of **BCS** can be predicted by analyzing the average depth and the average running time of a part of branches.

References

References

Aubry, P., Lazard, D., Maza, M.M., On the Theory of Triangular Sets, *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 25, 105-124, 1999.

Bardet, M., Faugere, J.C., Salvy, B. Complexity of Gröbner Basis Computation for Semi-regular Overdetermined sequences over F2 with Solutions in F2, *INRIA report RR-5049*, 2003.

Bardet M., Faugre J.C., Salvy B., and Spaenlehauer P.J., On the complexity of solving quadratic boolean systems, *Journal of Complexity*, 29(1):53-75, 2013.

Biere, A., Linear Algebra, Boolean Rings and Resolution, *ACA'08*, July, Austria, 2008.

Bouillaguet, C., Chen, H.-C., Cheng, C.-M., Chou, T., Niederhagen, R., Shamir, A., Yang, B.-Y.: Fast Exhaustive Search for Polynomial Systems in $\mathbb{F}_2$. CHES 2010. LNCS, vol. 6225, pp. 203-218. Springer, Heidelberg.

Boulier, F., Lazard, D., Ollivier, F., Petitiot, M., Representation for the Radical of a Finitely Generated Differential Ideal, *Proc. of ISSAC'95*, 158-166, ACM Press, New York, 1995.

Bouziane, D., Kandri Rody, A., and Maârouf, H., Unmixed-dimensional Decomposition of a Finitely Generated Perfect Differential Ideal, *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, **31**, 631-649, 2001.

Brickenstein, M. and Dreyer, A., PolyBoRi: A Framework for Gröbner Basis Computations with Boolean Polynomials, *MEGA 2007*, July, 2007, Austria.

Bryant, R.E., Graph-Based Algorithms for Boolean Function Manipulation, *IEEE Trans. on Computers*, 35(8), 677-691, 1986.

Canteaut, A. and Filiol, E., Ciphertext only Reconstruction of Stream Ciphers Based on Combination Generators, *Fast Software Encryption*, LNCS 1978, 165-180, Springer, 2000.

Chai, F., Gao, X.S., and Yuan C., A Characteristic Set Method for Solving Boolean Equations and Applications in Cryptanalysis of Stream Ciphers, *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 21(2), 191-208, 2008.

Chou, S.C., *Mechanical Geometry Theorem Proving,* D. Reidel, Dordrecht, 1988.

Chou, S.C. and Gao, X.S., Ritt-Wu's Decomposition Algorithm and Geometry Theorem Proving, *Proc. of CADE-10*, LNAI 449, 207-220, Springer, 1990.

Coron, J.S. and de Weger, B., ECRYPT: Hardness of the Main Computational Problems Used in Cryptography, *European Network of Excellence in Cryptology*, 2007.

Courtois N T, Meier W., Algebraic attacks on stream ciphers with linear feedback, Advances in CryptologyEUROCRYPT 2003. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 345-359, 2003.

Courtois, N., Klimov, A., Patarin, J., and Shamir, A., Efficient Algorithms for Solving Over-determined Systems of Multivariate Polynomial Equations, *EUROCRYPT 2000*, LNCS 1807, 392-407, 2000.

Courtois, N., Higher Order Correlation Attacks, XL Algorithm, and Cryptanalysis of Toyocrypt, *ICISC*, LNCS 2587, 182-199, Springer, 2002.

Cook, S., From Satisfiability to Proof Complexity and Bounded Arithmetic, *SAT 2004*, Invited Talk, 10-13 May, 2004, Vancouver, Canada.

Cook, S. and Nguyen, P., *Logical Foundations of Proof Complexity*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Dahan, X., Maza, M.M., Schost, E., Wu, W., Xie, Y., Lifting Techniques for Triangular Decompositions, *Proc. ISSAC'05*, 108-115, ACM Press, New York, 2005.

Faugère, J.C., A New Efficient Algorithm for Computing Gröbner Bases (F4), *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 139(1–3), 61–88, 1999.

Faugère, J.C., A New Efficient Algorithm for Computing Gröbner Bases Without Reduction to Zero F5, *Proc. ISSAc 2002*, 75-83, 2002.

Faugère, J.C. and Ars, G., An Algebraic Cryptanalysis of Nonlinear Filter Generators Using Gröbner Bases, TR No. 4739, INRIA, 2003.

Gallo, G., and Mishra, B., Efficient Algorithms and Bounds for Wu-Ritt Characteristic Sets, in *Effective Methods in Algebraic Geometry*, 119-142, Birkhauser, Boston, 1991.

Gao, X.S., and Chou, S.C., Solving Parametric Algebraic Systems, *Proc. ISSAC'92*, 335-341, ACM Press, 1992.

Gao, X.S. and Huang, Z., Characteristic set algorithms for equation solving in finite fields, Journal of Symbolic Computation, 47(6), 655-679, 2012.

Gao, X.S., van der Hoeven, J., Yuan, C., and Zhang, G., Characteristic Set Method for Differential-Difference Polynomial Systems, *MEGA 2007*. Accepted by Journal of Symbolic Computation.

Gerdt, V. and Zinin, M., A Pommaret Division Algorithm for Computing Gröbner Bases in Boolean Rings, *Proc. ISSAC 2008*, ACM Press, 2008.

Huang, Z. and Lin, D. Attacking Bivium and Trivium with the Characteristic Set Method. Progress in Cryptology- AFRICACRYPT 2011, LNCS, Volume 6737, 77-91, 2011.

Huang, Z., Parametric Equation Solving and Quantifier Elimination in Finite Fields with the Characteristic Set Method. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 25(4), 778-791, 2012.

Huang, Z. and Lin, D., A New Method for Solving Polynomial Systems with Noise over $\mathbb{F}_2$ and Its Applications in Cold Boot Key Recovery, Selected Areas in Cryptography, pp16-33, LNCS 7707, Windsor, Canada, 2013.

Hubert, E., Factorization-free Decomposition Algorithms in Differential Algebra, *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 29, 641-662, 2000.

He, S. and Zhang, B., Solving SAT by Algorithm Transform of Wu's Method, *J. Comput. Sci. and Tech.*, 14, 468-480, 1999.

Kalkbrener, M., A Generalized Euclidean Algorithm for Computing Triangular Representations of Algebraic Varieties, *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 15, 143-167, 1993.

Kapur, D. and Wan, H.K., Refutational Proofs of Geometry Theorems via Characteristic Sets, *Proc. ISSAC'90*, 277-284, ACM Press New York, 1990.

Lazard, D., A New Method for Solving Algebraic Systems of Positive Dimension, *Discrete Appl. Math.*, **33**, 147-160, 1991.

Li X, Mou C, Wang D., Decomposing polynomial sets into simple sets over finite fields: The zero-dimensional case, Computers & Mathematics with Applications, 60(11): 2983-2997, 2010.

Lidl, R. and Niederreiter, H., *Finite Fields*, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Lin, D. and Liu, Z., Some Results on Theorem Proving in Geometry over Finite Fields, *Proc. ISSAC'93*, 292-300, ACM Press, New York, 1993.

Maza, M.M., Reid, G.J., Scott, R., Wu, W, On Approximate Triangular Decompositions in Dimension Zero, *Jornal of Symbolic Computation*, 42(7), 693-716, 2007.

Menezes, A., van Ooschot, P., Vanstone, S., *Hanndbook of Applied Cryptography*, CRC Press, 1996.

Minto, S., Zero-Sppressed BDDs for Set Manipulation in Combinatorial Problems, *Proc. ACM/IEEE Design Automation*, 272-277, ACM Press, 1993.

Möller, H.M., On Decomposing Systems of Polynomial Equations with Finitely Many Solutions, *J. AAECC*,

4, 217–230, 1993.
Ritt, J.F., *Differential Algebra*, Amer. Math. Soc. Colloquium, 1950.
Sato, Y. and Inoue, S., On the Construction of Comprehensive Boolean Gröbner Bases. *Proc. ASCM 2005*, 145-148, 2005.
Smale, S, Mathematical Problems for The Next Century, *Math. Intelligencer*, 20, 7-15, 1998.
Wang, D. An Elimination Method for Polynomial Systems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 16, 83-114, 1993.
van de Woestijne, C., Deterministic equation solving over finite fields, *Proc. ISSAC 2005*, 348-353, ACM Press, 2005.
Wu, W.T. Basic Principles of Mechanical Theorem-proving in Elementary Geometries, *Journal Automated Reasoning*, 2, 221-252, 1986.
Yang, L., Zhang, J.Z., and Hou, X.R., *Non-linear Algebraic Equations and Automated Theorem Proving* (in Chinese), ShangHai Science and Education Pub., Shanghai, 1996.